REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 12, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 remain pending in this application and currently stand rejected. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection. Claims 6, 7, and 12 have also been amended for similar reason as well as to clarify that focusing on a second data field is automatic. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification (page 3, lines 5-17; page 15, lines 1-5; and page 11, lines 19-23). No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Action rejected claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 are supported in the specification (page 3, lines 5-17; page 15, lines 1-5; and page 11, lines 19-23) and are allowable as amended.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Action rejected claims 1, 3-7, and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,899,276 to Stadler (hereinafter *Stadler*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,646,250 to Childress (hereinafter *Childress*) and U.S. Patent No. 5,736,984 to Jellinek, *et al* (hereinafter *Jellinek*). The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Stadler teaches a field-directed help screen technique for a data entry system that responds to a user request for help by overwriting a portion of the data entry screen (Stadler, Abstract and column 2, lines 38-41). Furthermore, *Stadler* recites "The essential elements of the invention are ... (4) that the help text disappear when the user keys a response into the field." *Stadler* also requires that "the program then waits until a response key is pressed. This may be any key, ..., it may be the ENTER key." (*Stadler*, column 3 line 66 - column 4 line 3 and column 4, lines 21 - 24)

Amended claim 1 recites "focusing on the first data field; in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; focusing on the second data field; hiding from view the first static information tip." Thus, the first static information tip is hidden simultaneously with or subsequent to focusing on the second data field. Moreover, the focusing on the second data field can be manual or automatic (Specification, page 15, lines 2-3). Amended claims 6, 7, and 12, in fact, have the express element of the focusing being automatic. Contrary to the amended claims, *Stadler* does not teach or suggest hiding the information tip simultaneously with or subsequent to focusing on the second data field. Additionally, *Stadler* requires an express user action (e.g. pressing the ENTER key) to shift to another field. Hence, amended claims include elements that are opposite to *Stadler's* disclosure.

Childress and *Jellinek* also fail to teach "focusing on the first data field; in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; focusing on the second data field; hiding from view the first static information tip." Accordingly, since *Stadler*, *Childress*, and *Jellinek* fail to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature specified in amended claims 1, 6, 7, and

12, alone or in combination, these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Claims 3-5 and 13 depend from amended independent claim 1, claim 14 depends from amended independent claim 6, claims 9-11 and 15 depend from amended independent claim 7. Thus, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 6, 7, and 12. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 3-5, 9-11, and 13-15 should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date are hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, PC

Date: May 12, 2006

Colin S. Wright
Colin S. Wright
Reg. No. 57,202

MERCHANT & GOULD, PC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

9